Region		Project Name								
SR	MP Limit	3	L Number	Contract Numb	ber	PS&E	Number	PIN Number(s)	WIN Number	Federal Aid Number
SEPA (e.g., EIS 1/1/99)			NEPA (e.g., CE 1/1/99)	1			Route Type (e.g., NHS)			Project Type (e.g., P1)
Final Desi	gn Decision	s Approval Date	By Whom with Title				Final Sum	mary Approval Date		By Whom with Title
Advertiser	ment Date	Reviewers							-	
REVIEW I		T FILE COMPONI	ENTS - 330.04		Yes N	lo <sup>(1)</sup>	N/A		REMAI	RKS
1. Is proje	ct log in the	project file?								
2. Is copy of design approval letter in the project file?										
3. Are the VE Study Workbook and VE Decision Document in the file?		file?								
4. Are required evaluate upgrades (EU) documented in the file?										
5. Are all o	design devia	itions documented	in the file?							
6. Is Desig	gn Variance	Inventory in the fil	e?							
7. Is cost of	estimate in t	he file?								
8. Is the work zone traffic control strategy (WZTCS) documented in the file?		in the file?								
Additional general review comments (use attachments if additional space		litional space is	necess	ary):	I					
		REVIEW	ITEMS		Yes N	lo <sup>(1)</sup>	N/A		REMAI	RKS

February 2. 1998

A. ACCIDENT HISTORY								
Applicable Yes□No □								
1. Is accident history in the file?	ппп							
2. Was accident history analyzed, and are conclusions documented in the file?								
Additional general review comments (use attachments if additional appear	in necessary):							
Additional general review comments (use attachments if additional space i	is necessary):							
B. AESTHETICS-VISUAL COMPONENTS								
Applicable Yes□No □								
Were roadside restoration and/or wetland mitigation plans reviewed and								
approved by appropriate authority?								
Additional general review comments (use attachments if additional space	s necessary):							
C. GEOLOGICAL, SOILS, & MATERIALS REPORTS AND PAVEMENT DESIGN - Chapters 510 & 520								
Applicable Yes No	onapiero o 10 & C	)AU						
Is OSC Materials Branch approved Materials Source Report in the file?								
	1							

REVIEW ITEMS	Yes	No <sup>(1)</sup>	N/A	REMARKS
2. Is OSC Materials Branch approved Soil Report in the file?				
3. Is OSC Materials Branch approved Resurfacing Report in the file?				
4. Is OSC Materials Branch approved Pavement Type Determination Form in the file?				
Reviewer's additional plan review items follow (use attachments if addition	al spa	ce is n	ecessar	у):
D. HORIZONTAL-VERTICAL ALIGNMENT - Chapters 440,620,630 & 650  Applicable Yes \( \subseteq \text{No} \subseteq \)				
Is design speed appropriate and documented in the file?				
Does vertical stopping sight distance comply with appropriate design standards?				
Does horizontal stopping sight distance comply with appropriate design standards?				
Does horizontal curvature and rate of superelevation comply with project design speed?				
5. Are superelevation transitions in reasonable compliance with standards?				

**REVIEW ITEMS** Yes No<sup>(1)</sup> N/A REMARKS Reviewer's additional plan review items follow (use attachments if additional space is necessary): E. GEOMETRICS - Chapters 430, 440, 640, & 1050 Applicable Yes No 1. Do lane and shoulder widths comply with standards? 2. Do pavement cross-slopes comply with standards? 3. Do roadway foreslopes and backslopes comply with standards? Additional general review comments (use attachments if additional space is necessary): F. HIGHWAY CAPACITY - Chapter 610 Applicable Yes ☐ No ☐ 1. Was capacity analysis performed? 2. Do improvements provide design year level of service that complies with Figure 610-1?

Reviewer's additional plan review items follow (use attachments if additional space is necessary): G. ROADSIDE SAFETY - Chapter 700 1. Is Design Clear Zone Inventory in the file? 2. Are decisions to not mitigate specific hazards documented with engineering analysis on the inventory form or by form reference to another document in the file? 3. Are roadside safety items that are deferred for two years documented in the Additional general review comments (use attachments if additional space is necessary): H. TRAFFIC BARRIERS - Chapter 710 Spot Checked 

Completely Checked Applicable Yes ☐ No ☐ 1. Do guardrail installations comply with standards? 2. Does barrier comply with Figure 700-5, Guidelines for Embankment Barrier 3. Do barrier installations comply with length of need requirements? 

Yes No<sup>(1)</sup> N/A

REMARKS

**REVIEW ITEMS** 

REVIEW ITEMS	Yes	NO <sup>(1)</sup>	N/A	REMARKS			
4. Are special barrier installations approved by the OSC Design Office, and is this documented in the file?							
5. Are appropriate barrier end treatment or protection provided at each barrier location?							
6. Is substandard bridge rail upgraded and is design acceptable?							
Reviewer's additional plan review items follow (use attachments if addition	al spa	ce is n	ecessar	y):			
I. SIGNING, DELINEATION, AND ILLUMINATION - Chapters 820, 830 & 840  Applicable Yes □ No □							
Does signing comply with Chapter 820?							
2. Is Bridge and Structures Office concurrence in the file for attaching sign supports to structures?							
3. Does delineation comply with Chapter 830?							
4. Is State Traffic Engineer approval to use less than or exceeding basic illumination documented in the file?							
5. Does Illumination comply with Chapter 840?							

REVIEW ITEMS	Yes No <sup>(1)</sup> N/	I/A REMARKS	
Reviewer's additional plan review items follow (use attachments if additio	nal space is neces	essary):	
J. SIGNALIZATION - Chapter 850			
Applicable Yes ☐ No ☐			
1. Are there approved signal permits in the file?			
The state of the s			
2. Is approved preliminary signal plan in the file?		<u>_</u>	
		]	
Reviewer's additional plan review items follow (use attachments if additio	nal space is neces	essary):	
K. INTERSECTIONS - Chapter 910			
Applicable Yes □ No □			
1. Are there intersection plans in the file when required by Chapter 910?		_	
		<b>」</b> │	
2. Does existing/new intersection sight distance comply with design standards and are analyses documented in the file?		¬	
and are analyses documented in the life?		┛	
3. Was appropriate design speed used to evaluate existing intersections or to			
design new intersections?			
ucaign new interactions:			
design new intersections:			
Were existing intersection skew angles evaluated in accordance with			
· ·			
Were existing intersection skew angles evaluated in accordance with appropriate design matrix?			
Were existing intersection skew angles evaluated in accordance with			

REVIEW ITEMS	Yes	No <sup>(1)</sup>	N/A	REMARKS				
6. Are new intersections or modifications to intersections designed to accommodate the selected design vehicle or is required encroachment justified?								
7. Are designs for new or revised intersections backed by an engineering evaluation based on a traffic analysis?								
8. Do all other geometrics for new intersections or modifications to intersections comply with design standards taper rates, roadway widths, shy, channelization, storage lengths, etc.?								
9. Is there documentation for the need and spacing and justification for the selected design vehicle for U-turn locations?								
10. Do bicycle lanes and pedestrian accommodations comply with standards?								
11. Are traffic islands designed to standards?								
Additional general review comments (use attachments if additional space is necessary):								
L. INTERCHANGES - Chapter 940  Applicable Yes No Refer to Section K, INTERSECTIONS for review of interchange intersections								
Is there an approved new or revised access point report in the file?								
2. Is there an approved interchange plan that includes channelization in the file?								
3. Is design backed by a traffic report that includes design year level of service analyses at critical locations?								

	REVIEW ITEMS	Yes	No <sup>(1)</sup>	N/A	REMARKS		
	all existing and planned median crossovers in accordance with the Il Master Plan for Median Crossovers, and is this documented in the						
right of Design	documentation for new crossovers and the design data, together with a way print showing the opening in red, been submitted to the OSC Office for right of way or limited access plan approval, and is this ented in the file?						
	IOV bypass lanes, shoulders, merges, and enforcement areas comply andards?						
	amp meter locations comply with standards, and does storage capacity with traffic report recommendations?						
8. Do v	eaving lanes comply with standards?						
	Reviewer's additional plan review items follow (use attachments if additional space is necessary):						
	IDGES - Chapter 1120 Applicable Yes No						
standa							
	ridge rails not restrict horizontal and/or intersection sight distances to standards?						

REVIEW ITEMS	Yes	No <sup>(1)</sup>	N/A	REMARKS
3. Do existing or proposed guardrail attachments and bridge connection transition sections comply with design standards?				
4. Was bridge type, size, and location (TS&L) prepared by Bridge and Structures Office?				
5. Where median is 8m or less in width, will gap be decked or netted over between parallel structures?				
6. Are all new structures and all modifications to existing structures designed by or reviewed and approved by the Bridge and Structures office, and are approvals documented in the file?				
7. Is Bridge and Structures Office concurrence to connect traffic barrier to bridge documented in the file?				
8. Is bridge deck protective treatment system designed by or reviewed and approved by the Bridge and Structures Office?				
9. Is OSC Design Office approval to install protective bridge screening in the file?				
10. Is method of attaching the protective screening to the bridge approved by the Bridge and Structures Office?				
11. Are bridge vertical clearance and bridge approach slabs standard or documented deviations in file?				
Additional general review comments (use attachments if additional space i	s nece	essary)	:	

N. HYDRAULIC DESIGN - Chapter 1210	
Applicable Yes No	
1. Was OSC/Region Hydraulics branch contacted for technical assistance when implementing stormwater management practices established by local governments?	
2. Was a safety rest area hydraulic report accomplished and reviewed and approved by the OSC/Region Hydraulics Branch?	
Reviewer's additional plan review items follow (use attachments if additional space is necessary):	
O. ACCESS CONTROL & FENCING - Chapters 1420 & 1460  Applicable Yes No	
1. Is State Design Engineer approval to defer access control documented in the file?	
2. If limited access is not implemented, is access management standards implemented?	
3. Is justification documented in the file for not installing access control fencing?	
Additional general review comments (use attachments if additional space is necessary):	

Yes No<sup>(1)</sup> N/A

**REMARKS** 

**REVIEW ITEMS** 

REVIEW ITEMS Yes No(1) N/A REMARKS P. OTHER ITEMS AS APPLICABLE 1. Do bicycle paths comply with standards? 2. Do pedestrian trails comply with standards? 3. Are the requirements of Chapter 1140 followed in the design of noise barriers, and is the documentation in the file? 4. Does the transit benefit facility design comply with Chapter 1060? 5. Does the weigh station design comply with Chapter 1040? 6. Are climbing lanes, passing lanes, and/or slow moving vehicle turnouts analyses documented in the file? 7. Do designs for proposed climbing lanes, passing lanes, and/or slow moving vehicle turnouts comply with Chapter 1010? 8. Are experimental feature approvals and approved work plans in the file? Reviewer's additional plan review items follow (use attachments if additional space is necessary):